

REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 7, 11-12 and 18-21 have been amended. Claims 1-12 and 14-21 are pending and under consideration.

The §112 rejections are overcome by the present amendments.

Independent claim 1 recites the common firmware is a multi-model firmware that can be used in the plurality of printing apparatus models. In contrast, the multiple printer driver of Kobayashi is applied to the host device to process a plurality of printers.

Furthermore, claim 1 recites a firmware unit to store function information of a plurality of models, supported by a common firmware. In contrast, Kobayashi (col. 11, ln. 29-42) teaches judging whether new firmware is applicable to the printers from version/application information. This implies that each version requires a particular firmware. This is a one-firmware/one-version system, as opposed to the claimed common firmware. In the broadest interpretation of Kobayashi, multiple firmware is compatible with a common printer version. This differs from a plurality of models being supported by a common firmware.

For example, under the broad interpretation of Kobayashi, printer version A could be supported by firmware F1, and F2, but not firmware F3. It is the firmware that judged. There is no teaching that firmware F1 is compatible with printer version A and printer version B. However, as claimed, models A, B and C could all be supported by firmware F1.

Independent claims 7, 11, 12, 18 and 21 are similarly patentable over Kobayashi.

Furthermore, claim 2 recites a model index processing unit to store a model index designation command received from outside the firmware unit, extract from the storage unit the function information which corresponds to the model index designated by the model index designation command upon the initialization of the printing apparatus, and output the extracted function information. The Examiner alleges that Kobayashi teaches the firmware storage has both the applicable firmware and the non-applicable firmware, and the firmware applying unit determines whether the firmware is applicable or not. However, the model index processing unit of claim 2 detects applicable function information from among the function information of the firmware. This differs from determining whether the firmware is applicable or not.

The remaining reference does not overcome these deficiencies.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 7-14-09

By: 
Michael J. Badagliacca
Registration No. 39,099

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501